

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACT

May 18, 2011, Representative Stakeholder Steering Committee Meeting MHSA Local Planning Update

LEARNING AND FEEDBACK FORM

	Uh, no		You bet!
1. After this meeting, I have a better understanding of what has changed as a result of AB100.	1 (N=18, Range: 3-5)	2 3	4 ↓ 5 4.5
2. After this meeting, I have a better understanding of why we are requesting MHSA funds prior to plan development.	1 (N=18, Range: 3-5)	2 3	4 ↓ 5 4.7
3. After this meeting, I have a better understanding of how the local stakeholder planning process will continue in the future.	1 (N=18, Range: 3-5)	2 3	4 ↓ 5 4.5
4. After this gathering, I am confident that we are on the right track with MHSA implementation.	1 (N=17, Range: 3-5)	2 3	4 ↓ 5 4.5

5. My key learnings from this meeting

- An understanding of AB100 & how it has changed our local processes? Also, an understanding of future projects & developments.
- AB100 change
- AB99 corollary
- Budget planning stakeholders
- All new – very good information!
- AB100 & local impact
- AB100 impacts & process changes
- Innovations project selected
- Ideas for Technological Needs projects
- Funding and changes at State and local levels
- One time redirection State level
- Current Community Services and Supports & Prevention Early Intervention still in place.
- Innovation planning going forward
- Future sustainability?
- I am not alone with my concerns. I feel encouraged. There are so many opportunities to contribute and serve. I am privileged to hear these conversations.
- The effects of AB100 to counties
- AB100 impact on BHRS
- Impact of AB100 projects funded (potentially) by the Innovation program.
- New MHSA info
- Helpful to get discussion on State budget & how it impacts MHSA.
- Discussion on the Innovation/Capital Facilities and Technological Needs.

6. What worked well during this meeting

- Good interaction & question-answering. Ability of presenters to clarify difficult concepts.
- Explanation was fine
- Note – In the world of IT – by the time you plan for it, IT changes radically 2 generations not considered.
- Small group discussion
- PowerPoint easy to follow. Conversation very healthy!
- Collaboration & audience involvement
- The ice breaker was fun & interesting
- The 10 minute table discussion
- Handouts were easy to follow & understand
- Dinner
- Clear & concise info
- Being called (I don't have email). Dinner was great.
- Discussion/group interaction and feedback
- Consumer representation at table
- PowerPoint – Great
- Short but to the point
- Good food
- Good company

7. What could be improved in future meetings

- Being able to see what will be discussed ahead of time (PowerPoint) so that volunteers can do some research prior to the meeting. (Easier to follow if we can look up unfamiliar terms before actual meeting)
- Housing – need consumer stakeholders who are not employees of BHRS or contractors.
- From my own level of understanding, this meeting was effective and enjoyable and informative.
- Hold meeting during normal business hours?
- More representation at table!

8. Any final comments

- Random wish = healthier beverage options (herbal tea)
- Sorry to see PRAP picked. A better program likely not proposed by RFP process – single gateway access tool – example – Friends are Good Medicine database – resource – including offline on paper as most homeless mentally ill don't have computers unless at Stanislaus County library or Consumer Empowerment Center – single map to services – that would be actual freedom to navigate system.
- Good meeting
- Very anxious to be involved in process
- Thank you!
- Meeting was great
- Good dinner
- Commend your efforts to educate explain and provide transparency about MHSA funding issues & planning process. Great job!
- Thank you for inviting community members. It's nice to connect with people from various organizations.
- Great work!
- Great food
- Good job